

From: Steve Goldsby
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/23/02 8:03am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to comment on at least one area of the proposed settlement, and how it clearly does very little to restrict microsoft's monopolistic tendencies.

The poposed judgement prohibits certain behaviors by Microsoft towards OEMs, but simultaneously allows the following exclusionary practices:

Section III.A.2. allows Microsoft to retaliate against any OEM that ships Personal Computers containing a competing Operating System but no Microsoft operating system.

Section III.B. requires Microsoft to license Windows on uniform terms and at published prices to the top 20 OEMs, but says nothing about smaller OEMs. This leaves Microsoft free to retaliate against smaller OEMs, including important regional 'white box' OEMs, if they offer competing products.

Section III.B. also allows Microsoft to offer unspecified Market Development Allowances -- in effect, discounts -- to OEMs. For instance, Microsoft could offer discounts on Windows to OEMs based on the number of copies of Microsoft Office or Pocket PC systems sold by that OEM. In effect, this allows Microsoft to leverage its monopoly on Intel-compatible operating systems to increase its market share in other areas, such as office software or ARM-compatible operating systems.

By allowing these practices, the Proposed Judgement is encouraging Microsoft to extend its monopoly in Intel-compatible operating systems, and to leverage it into new areas.

Please take action to ensure the ability of other businesses to compete in this space.

Steve Goldsby, CEO
Integrated Computer Solutions, Inc.
www.integrate-u.com <<http://www.integrate-u.com>>